



THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
Department of Agricultural Resources
**State Reclamation and
Mosquito Control Board**
251 Causeway Street, Suite 500
Boston, MA 02114-2151



MITT ROMNEY
Governor

KERRY HEALEY
Lt. Governor

Mark S. Buffone, Chairman
Department of Agricultural Resources
Charlie M. Burnham
Department of Conservation & Recreation
Gary P. Gonyea
Department of Environmental Protection

ELLEN ROY HERZFELDER
EOEA Secretary

DOUGLAS P. GILLESPIE
MDAR Commissioner

Donna Mitchell
Projects Administrator
Tel: (617) 626-1715
Fax: (617) 626-1850

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MINUTES

WHO: State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board (SRMCB)
DATE: **May 25, 2005**
WHERE: 240 Beaver Street, Waltham, MA

PRESENT: Representing

State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board

Mark Buffone, SRMCB, Chairman
Charlie Burnham, SRMCB, Member
Gary Gonyea, SRMCB, Member
Donna Mitchell, SRMCB, Projects Administrator

Mosquito Control Project Commissions

Bill Mara Sr.

Mosquito Control Directors/Superintendents

Wayne Andrews, Bristol County Mosquito Control Project
Tim Deschamps, Central Mass Mosquito Control Project
John Doane, Cape Cod Mosquito Control Project
David Henley, East Middlesex Mosquito Control Project
Jake Jurgenson, Berkshire County Mosquito Control Project
Tim McGlinchy, Central Mass Mosquito Control Project
Walt Montgomery, Northeast Mass Mosquito Control and Wetlands District
Gabrielle Sakolsky, Cape Cod Mosquito Control Project
John Smith, Norfolk County Mosquito Control Project
Robert "Bob" Thorndike, Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project

Others

Helen Miranda Wilson

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MAY 25, 2005 MINUTES

Introduction

Chairman Mark Buffone officially called the meeting of the State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board to order at 10:10 AM on Wednesday, May 25, 2005 taking place at the UMass Eastern Extension Center at 240 Beaver Street Waltham, MA (or known as the Waltham Field Station).

For the record, the Chairman noted that this meeting had been filed with the Secretary of State and the Executive office of Administration and Finance in accordance with the General Laws of Massachusetts.

The Chairman acknowledged the other Board members present, Charlie Burnham representing the Department of Conservation and Recreation, and Gary Gonyea, representing the Department of Environmental Protection and in doing so noted that there was a quorum.

Chairman Buffone thanked everyone for coming and expressed appreciation for their interest and encouraged those in attendance to participate constructively when acknowledged.

Those present were asked to complete the sign-up sheet as it was passed around the room to insure an accurate account of who were present.

The Chairman also welcomed with a special acknowledgement Commissioner Bill Mara Sr. who represented the Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project and Helen Miranda Wilson who was seeking appointment as a new Commissioner to the Cape Cod Mosquito Control Project

The Chairman asked if any of the Board members and others present if they had any introductory remarks. There were none. However, the Chairman made the following remarks for the record.

Agenda Item #1: Introductory Remarks

Background:

Chairman Buffone informed the Board and those present of the following:

- The meeting scheduled for March 23, 2005 was postponed. As a result, the last time the Board met was January 12, 2005. Also, the meeting scheduled for June 8, 2005 in Waltham was postponed too. Since the next meeting was scheduled for October 12, 2005, he asked those present to keep this in mind when addressing agenda item 7 for the purpose of setting another meeting date.

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MAY 25, 2005 MINUTES

- At the previous meeting of the Board, there was agreement to send a letter to the various Department heads and appointing authorities of the respective Board members alerting these individuals to the potential threat of arbovirus in 2005 and potential costs of such a threat. A letter was sent in February of 2005 to the respective Department Heads of the Department of Agricultural Resources, Department of Environmental Protection, and the Department of Conservation and Recreation
- Consequently, another letter was sent to the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs from the Department of Ag Resources concerning this matter. The Chairman mentioned that a mosquito-borne disease task force might be convened to plan the logistics for any operational responses to a potential arbovirus problem later in the summer. At some point, the Chairman commented that the Board would ask for mosquito control project 's input and participation on this task force.
- The Board will send technical and other articles of interest to the mosquito control projects from time to time. Recently, three (3) articles titled *Efficacy And Persistence of Altosid Pellets Against Culex Species In Catch Basins In Michigan*, *Do Backyard Mosquito Sprays Work?* and *Mosquito Behavior and Vector Control* were mailed to the all districts.
- The Department of Public health (DPH) Pledge of Confidentiality was reviewed by legal counsel and the Chairman encouraged anyone who has not signed it to do so and send to DPH.
- A publication titled *Identification Guide to Mosquitoes of Connecticut* published by the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station is available and David Henley who mentioned that there was another new publication on mosquito identification available by renowned Authors Darsie and Ward.
- CDC has recommended DEET (the traditional and effective mosquito repellant) along with a new one that the Massachusetts Pesticide Board Subcommittee has registered. The new active ingredient called Picaridin contains 7% picaridin and is odorless and more cosmetically appealing. The product name is Cutter Advanced Insect Repellant. This is important to be aware of especially as it relates to public outreach. Also, a resource on picaridin was provided in the paperwork distributed at the meeting

Questions and Discussion:

NONE

Action Taken:

NONE

Agenda Item #2: Approval of Minutes of January 12, 2005

Background:

Chairman Buffone noted that the minutes of January 12, 2005 was in order and entertained a motion to approve them as written.

Questions and Discussion:

Dave Henley asked if the indemnification policy had been mailed out to his Commissioners. The Chair responded that the document was mailed out and electronically forwarded to the Commissioner list serve. However, the Chair said he would check to make sure the East Middlesex Commissions received it and would send out copies as soon as possible.

Action Taken:

Charlie Burnham made a motion to approve the January 12, 2005 minutes outlined and the motion was second by Gary Gonyea. The vote to approve the minutes carried unanimously.

Agenda Item # 3: Commissioners Terms Expiring November 30, 2005

Background:

Chairman Buffone brought to the Board's attention, those Commissioners who terms expire on November 30, 2005. The Board discussed and agreed upon as a Board that they would notify those Commissioners coming up for re-appointment several months before the expiration of their terms. The reason being that the Board is making an effort to better organize this process and wants to re-appoint Commissioners who express interest and vote their new terms either a 3 or 5-year term as of December 1, of any year. The Chairman read aloud the following eight (8) names and expiration dates.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Mosquito Control District</i>	<i>Expiration Date</i>
David Colburn	Berkshire	11/30/2005
Gordon Wolfe	Bristol	11/30/2005
James Quirk Jr.	Cape Cod	11/30/2005
George Smith Jr	Central	11/30/2005
Richard Pollack	Norfolk	11/30/2005

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MAY 25, 2005 MINUTES

James Foley	Northeast	11/30/2005
Michael Pieroni	Plymouth	11/30/2005
John Kelly	Suffolk	11/30/2005

Questions and Discussion:

John Doane requested that the Board consider holding interviews closer to or at the Mosquito Control District headquarters as a courtesy when interviewing Commissioners for re-appointment.

The Chairman responded that it was his experience that those Commissioners who have traveled to interviews did not feel it was a significant issue but noted it for the record.

A question was raised asking the Board where the offices of the DCR were located in Western Ma. Charlie Burnham responded that the DCR had two offices one in Amherst and the other in Pittsfield.

Action Taken:

The Projects Administrator, Donna Mitchell, would send letters and applications to all Commissioners who terms expired on November 30, 2005

Agenda Item #4: RAMP FIELD TESTS FOR 2005

Background:

Chairman Buffone presented the following background summary regarding RAMP to shed some light on this issue and to bring everyone up to date as it affects all mosquito control districts even though only one district, the Northeast District, is utilizing the field-testing.

Last year the Board approved the use of the RAMP testing or **The Rapid Analyte Measurement Platform (RAMP) Testing** for evaluation purposes. The RAMP test is a field test to determine if mosquitoes are positive for West Nile Virus.

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MAY 25, 2005 MINUTES

The Northeast Mosquito Control and Wetlands Management District Commission approved the use of RAMP field-testing for West Nile Virus (WNV) for its members communities during the 2004 mosquito season.

Also, the SRMCB approved the testing and the districts "Policy and Procedure for Testing and Submission of Reactive Samples" with some minor modifications. The approval was based on the fact that this testing would be a collaborative pilot project with the Department of Public Health (DPH). More importantly, DPH was willing to test samples from the mosquito district that were reactive after the field test. The motivating factors for the use of field-testing was based upon a number of mosquito control districts dissatisfaction with DPH communication and turn-around- time to determine whether or not mosquitoes were positive for WNV and/or Eastern Equine Encephalitis (EEE).

Although the testing was approved for 2004, a number of concerns existed such as RAMP accuracy and sensitivity. These concerns were expressed by both the SRMCB and DPH. These very concerns became apparent once the testing for 2004 was finished. The data from the 2004 season indicated that only 1 of 14 RAMP reactives was confirmed as a true positive for WNV.

The results of the field-testing in 2004 and other published information regarding the WNV RAMP test lead to a conclusion by DPH that the test is not an appropriate method for public health surveillance purposes for 2005. More importantly, the initial reason for moving toward field-testing has been resolved since communication and turn-around-time to determine virus activity was significantly improved by DPH.

Based on the below listed reasons, Chairman Buffone told DPH that he would ask the full Board to formally vote that the RAMP testing be discontinued at the Northeast Mosquito Control District or any other mosquito control district in Massachusetts who intend to incorporate into their programs for the foreseeable future.

- this field test is not an appropriate method for public health surveillance purposes;
- the positive predictive value is extremely poor;
- False negative results could have serious consequences with regard to protecting public health;
- DPH will not accept mosquito pools pre-tested by RAMP field tests for confirmatory testing;
- DPH timeliness and accuracy of testing has significantly improved and offers the best system for assuring the safety and confidence of the public;
- a solid collaborative mechanism and protocol currently exists between DPH and the organized mosquito control districts to deliver and document mosquito samples sent to the State Labs for testing.

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MAY 25, 2005 MINUTES

However, the Chairman also noted that he received e-mail from Robert Morehouse Chairman of the Northeast Mosquito Control Commission asking for the opportunity to continue the testing for one additional year on a trial basis after hearing his staff's comments about the potential for successfully developing the technology and their desire to validate the procedures. Mr. Morehouse requested an accommodation or compromise since they already have the equipment and an entomologist to continue the work.

After presenting the background summary, the Chairman stated that the issue for the Board today is to approve continuation of the testing on a trial basis for 2005, disapprove it altogether, or in fact approve it with restrictions. These restrictions include but are not limited to limiting any reactivities found as a result of testing in 2005 to be used for guiding mosquito trapping only and any RAMP "reactive results" should not be reported as "positive" tests for WNV to member communities.

Questions and Discussion:

The Chairman expressed his feelings stating that since DPH has significantly improved the turn-around- time for virus testing, it did not appear to be useful to continue the RAMP field-testing. However, the Chairman also felt that mosquito control districts should be encouraged to explore new innovations or tools for the purpose of science and research. Additionally, the Chairman out of deference to the Northeast Chairman request for accommodation, ask the other members if there was another option that could be considered.

Finally, he commented that the major issue for the SRMCB to consider in our decision is that DPH has declined to do confirmatory testing of RAMP reactivities. Therefore, if the Board does approve RAMP for use in 2005, the testing must be restricted, and oversight will be necessary to insure that any noteworthy results would be carefully interpreted and not shared with member communities. Further, that if RAMP testing fails to yield results, the SRMCB or DPH can have confidence in, then the entire use of RAMP is to be terminated.

The Chairman indicated he would like to see the field testing continued but without the DPH confirmatory testing recommended that the testing not be approved unless another option could be discussed and asked for comments from the other members

Charlie Burnham commented that given the amount of errors in the 2004 testing and without confirmatory testing, it appeared that RAMP would have to be shelved until more information could be obtained.

Gary Gonyea mentioned that he was disappointed that DPH would not continue to process the reactive samples. He felt that the testing could serve as a useful tool especially in targeting additional traps in problematic areas.

The Chair ask if anyone else had any comments

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MAY 25, 2005 MINUTES

Walter Montgomery of the Northeast District stated that the new technology must be given more time to determine if it can be useful. He noted the example of the mosquito larvicide Bti when first introduced and how it took time to see useful results. He further stated that the positive indicated by RAMP field-testing allowed them to place additional traps in the city of Revere. As a result, every collection obtained was positive for West Nile Virus. He remarked the district would never have found those mosquitoes if not for the RAMP field test.

Wayne Andrews commented that a lot of mosquitoes are discarded because of the DPH pool limit of 60 pools per county. He remarked that more mosquitoes should be tested in all counties. He pointed out that other places could do confirmatory testing such as CDC, University of Connecticut, University of Rhode Island, which have certified labs. He asked if our views might be changed if one of these were willing to do the confirmatory testing. Finally, he stated that RAMP field-testing, although in an experimental stage here, could provide prompt direction for in-house district work.

The Chairman asks how much would it cost to have a private certified lab to confirm samples? Wayne Andrews responded that some of the entities suggested might do the testing without charge due to the small number of samples that Northeast would have tested.

David Henley asked about the manufacturer of the tests? Walter Montgomery stated that they along with others were frustrated with the poor results and has worked with the manufacturer to make improvements. He conceded that there was a learning process involved with the entire field test program. As a result, he would hate to see the testing terminated only after one season of results.

David Henley suggested that Walter's district approach the seller of the product to see if they could find a certified private lab for the purpose of confirmatory testing.

Walter Montgomery asked the Board if there was another meeting for June? The Board responded that although the originally scheduled meeting for June 8th was postponed, the Board needs to vote on Commissioner appointments so that another meeting would likely be scheduled.

As a result, Walter Montgomery asked the Board to consider postponing action to explore further this issue.

Action Taken:

Based on the discussions, the Board felt there was merit in pursuing this issue further and as a result postponed further action until the Board obtains additional information allowing the Northeast District additional time to explore other options.

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MAY 25, 2005 MINUTES

Agenda Item # 5: Mosquito Control and Board Budgets/Funding Certification and Policy

Background:

For a number of years, the SRMCB permitted the mosquito control budgets/assessments process to be coordinated via the Board's administrator and Department of Revenue (DOR). Also, there has been some debate and a general lack of knowledge as it relates to whether or not mosquitoes expended for mosquito control services are state funds or local municipal funds.

This issue came to the SRMCB's attention that mosquito control districts were communicating directly with DOR when the project administrator was out due to an accident. Also, the DOR expressed recent concerns about the lack of protocol and subsequent changes to estimated budgets. Since DOR update the local aid estimates to cities and towns, total budget changes without some kind of protocol creates conditions that can cause conflicts and more work. The Chairman met with the representatives from DOR. In fact, the DOR representatives were unaware that there was oversight authority above the project administrator and mosquito control districts. Also, DOR has been notified that there is a law mandates that the Board be involved in this process and shall annually certify to the comptroller that expenditures for the fiscal year do not exceed related assessments. According to Section 5A of Chapter 252 of the MGL, the Board determines what is necessary since the funding is no longer subject to appropriation of the legislature and have been made trust accounts.

For the purpose of this meeting, the Board needs to vote on FY 06 budget/assessments amounts (which were negotiated between DOR and the districts) distributed in member information packages and notify DOR of these amount as soon as possible (by the end of this week) so that they can determine and update local aid estimates so that cities and towns have a clearer picture of how much state funding they will receive reduced by the amounts for mosquito control services. Also, the Board needs to approve a new policy regarding submission of budget/assessments numbers and process of communication and justifications for increases by mosquito control districts. The policy is to outline the expectations of both the Board and DOR to better plan for budget/assessment amounts.

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MAY 25, 2005 MINUTES

Questions and Discussion:

Walter Montgomery asked the Board why they chose May 15th since many towns have meetings late in May or in early June. Also, towns have special meetings in June. It was his understanding that they had until the end of August.

Chairman Buffone explained that we need a policy with established dates so that each entity involved such as the SRMCB and DOR can accomplish their obligations and responsibility in a timely fashion.

The concerned expressed what happens if town joins or withdraws from mosquito control after the established dates in the policy. We would look at these situations on a case-by-case if goes above and beyond an established deadline. When districts meet municipal officials such as finance committees should take this as an opportunity to educate them of established deadlines. The Chairman remarked that the main issue is that the Board has expectations that the districts will plan accordingly as managers of the budgets with established deadlines. To have a process that provides numbers to allow sufficient time to review numbers.

Its not the projects decision but municipal decisions. The deadlines are linked to DOR mandates as well as allowing a period of time to SRMCB to review.

John Doane suggested that the Board consider modified the policy by adding the wording "on or before" the established dates.

The Chair stated that he would see if DOR representatives could be available at the next meeting.

Action Taken:

Chairman Buffone made a motion to approve and certify the estimated budget assessments and appropriations as outlined in a document titled FY05/06 State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Districts/Administrative Budgets given to SRMCB members and to notify the appropriate state agencies of these amounts. Gary Gonyea seconded the motion and was voted unanimously.

Chairman Buffone made a motion was made that the Board accept the policy numbered 2005-2 regarding submission of budget/assessment numbers for any fiscal year and the manner the districts must communicate with DOR regarding funding including the modification of adding the wording "on or before" directly in front of the various deadline dates of December 30th, May 15th, and October 15th be approved. Charlie Burnham seconded the motion and voted unanimously.

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MAY 25, 2005 MINUTES

Agenda Item # 6: Old Business SRMCB Policies, Minutes, 2005 Commission Goals, refinement of Commissioner Appointment Process

Background:

The SRMCB has developed and will continue to develop policies to improve direction and guidance to mosquito control operations. Chairman Buffone stated he appreciated the input regarding these policies and mentioned that revisions were made to all the policies based on this input.

Questions and Discussion:

The Chairman congratulated those districts, in particular, Bristol, Cape Cod, Central, Norfolk, who have been already carrying out the SRMCB policies such as submitting minutes and meeting notices electronically and coping these documents to the other Board members.

The Chair asked if there were any other comments or questions on these revised policies. There was none.

Action Taken:

None

Agenda item # 7: Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items

Background:

Before a motion was made to adjourn the meeting, Helen Miranda Wilson requested that the SRMCB interview her as a candidate for Commissioner during the meeting.

Gary Gonyea made a motion to take a brief recess and resume the Board meeting after such recess to interview the new applicant for Commissioner. Charlie Burnham seconded the motion and vote carried unanimously.

Interview For Commissioner

The Chairman re-opened the meeting continuing the Board meeting of May 25th Per the request of the applicant seeking to fill a vacancy on the Cape Cod Mosquito Control Project.

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MAY 25, 2005 MINUTES

The Chairman noted that he had received a completed application, letters of support, and a signed statement regarding the roles and responsibilities of Commissioners. The Chair asked if Ms Wilson received an official letter scheduling her interview, along with directions, and sample questions. She responded that she received everything.

The SRMCB proceeded to interview the candidate. At the close of the interview, the Chairman asked the other members if they had any additional questions. No additional questions were raised.

Chairman Buffone raised the issue for Commissioner stipend for someone who works for a municipality would not be eligible for the Commissioner stipend.

On behalf of the Board, he acknowledged and expressed appreciation for Ms Wilson's interest and time.

Lastly, Chairman Buffone mentioned that the policy to appoint and re-appoint Commissioners included getting feedback from the Cape Cod Commission, which the Board may request, input.

Action Taken:

The Board agreed to discuss the appointment of the applicant interviewed and most likely vote at the next Board Meeting

Agenda item # 7: Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items (continued)

Background:

None

Questions and Discussion:

None

Action Taken:

Charlie Burnham made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 12:50 PM and seconded by Gary Gonyea and voted unanimously.

Respectfully submitted:

Mark S. Buffone
Chairman